

A Textual Analysis of Isaiah 30

Andrew Cross
 The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
 February 7, 2014

I. Table of All Variants – Isaiah 30

Reference	MTT	1QIsa ^a	4QIsa ^c	Discussion
Isa 30:1	נָאָם	נוֹאָם		Mater lectionis reflects different pronunciation.
Isa 30:3	לְכָלָמָה:	לְכָמָה		Copying Error
Isa 30:4	כִּי־חֲנִין	כִּי הִיה		Difference in number. Significant variant
Isa 30:5	הַבָּאֵישׁ הַבִּישׁ	בָּאֵשׁ		Confusion of aleph. Significant variant.
Isa 30:6	מְחוּם	וְאֵין מִים		Scribal Emendation. Significant variant.
Isa 30:6		וְצִיה		Omission. Significant Variant.
Isa 30:6	יִשְׂאוֹ	יִשְׂא		Difference in number. Significant variant.
Isa 30:6	חִילְקָם	אוֹצְרוֹתָם		Emendation. Significant Variant.
Isa 30:7	לְזֹאת	לְזֹאת		Mater lectionis – no difference in meaning.
Isa 30:7	רְהַב הָם	רְהַבָּהָם		Significant Variant.
Isa 30:8	כְּתַבָּה	כְּתַבָּה א	כְּתֻבוֹ ב	Lack of 3 rd person, sing, fem., pronomial suffix in 4QIsa ^c .
Isa 30:8	אָתָם	אָותָם		Significant Variant.
Isa 30:9	שְׁמוּעַ	לְשָׁמוּעַ		Addition of prepositional prefix.
Isa 30:10	מְהֻתָּלוֹת	מְתֻלוֹת	[מְחַת לְ[ו]ת]	Difference in Spelling. Scribal error.
Isa 30:11	סּוּרוֹ	תְּסִירֹו	סּוּרוֹ	Difference in Form.
Isa 30:12	וְגַלְוֹז	וְתַעַלְוֹז	וְ[ג]לְ[ו]ז	Scribal emendation.
Isa 30:13	הַעֲזֹן	הַעֲזֹה{וְוְ}		Uncertain reading.

Isa 30:14	יחמָל	יחמָלוּ		Difference in number. Significant variant.
Isa 30:14	ולחְשָׁף	ולחְסֹוף		Mater lectionis – no difference in meaning.
Isa 30:15	בְּשׁוּבָה	בְּשִׁיבָה	בְּשׁוּבָה	Difference in Spelling.
Isa 30:16	עַל	אֶל		Scribal error.
Isa 30:17	הַקֵּר	הַר		Loss of definite article. Significant Variant.
Isa 30:18	ירּוּם	ירּוּם		Qal vs. hiphil form. Significant variant.
Isa 30:19	תְּבֻכָּה	תְּבֻכוּ		Significant variant.
Isa 30:25	תְּאַמְּנִינוּ	תְּיַאמְּנִינוּ		Difference in pronunciation.
Isa 30:25	יְבָלֵי	יְבוּלֵי		Difference in pronunciation.
Isa 30:28	לְהַנְפָּה	לְנִפְהָ		Spelling difference.
Isa 30:28	גּוּם	גּוֹאִים		Mater Lectionis.
Isa 30:28	לְחֵי	לְוחֵי(י)		Spelling difference.
Isa 30:29	לְכָם	לְכָמָה		Spelling difference.
Isa 30:29	הַתְּקִדְשָׁה חָג	הַתְּקִדְישׁוּ חָג		Difference in form. Significant Variant.
Isa 30:31	יְבָהָ	יְאָבוֹ		Significant variant.
Isa 30:32	מוֹסְדָּה	מוֹסְדוֹ		Spelling difference. Significant variant.
Isa 30:33	תְּפִתְחָה	תְּפִתְחָ		Scribal error.
Isa 30:33	(הַזֹּא) [הִיא]	הִיא		Scribal emendation. Significant variant.
Isa 30:33	הַוּכָן	יוֹכָן הַבִּינִי		
Isa 30:33	הַעֲמִיקִי	וְהַעֲמִיקִי		Spelling difference.
Isa 30:33	הַרְחָבָה	הַרְחָבִי		Spelling difference
Isa 30:33	מַדְרָתָה	מַדְרוֹתָה		Mater lectionis.

II. Table of Significant Variants – Isaiah 30

Reference	MTT	1QIsa ^a	Preferred Reading	Translation
Isa 30:5	כָּל הַבָּאֵשׁ כָּל הַבִּישׁ	כָּלָה בְּאֵשׁ	הַבִּישׁ כָּל	All are brought <i>to shame</i> because of a people that will not benefit them...
Isa 30:6	מִקְּרָם	וְאֵין מִים	מִקְּרָם	...a land of distress and pressure, <i>of which comes a lioness, and a lion...</i>
Isa 30:6	יִשְׂאוֹ	יִשְׂאָה	יִשְׂאוֹ	... <i>they carry their riches...</i>
Isa 30:6	חַילְלָתֶם	אוֹצְרוֹתֶם	חַילְלָתֶם	riches
Isa 30:7	רָהָב הַם	רָהָבָם	רָהָב הַם	<i>Rahab who is still.</i>
Isa 30:8	אַתֶּם	אָתֶם	אַתֶּם	Before them
Isa 30:9	שְׁמֹעוֹן	לְשֻׁמוּעָה	שְׁמֹעוֹן	unwilling <i>to listen to the law of God.</i>
Isa 30:11	סָרוּרוֹ	תְּסִירֹו	סָרוּרוֹ	<i>Turn from the way</i>
Isa 30:12	וְנוּלוֹז	וְתַעַלֹּוֹז	וְנוּלוֹז	perverseness
Isa 30:14	יְחִמָּל	יְחִמָּלוּ	יְחִמָּל	without sparing
Isa 30:15	בְּשׁוֹבֶה	בְּשִׁיבָה	בְּשׁוֹבֶה	returning
Isa 30:17	הַקֵּר	הַר	הַקֵּר	On the top of the mountain...
Isa 30:18	יְרֻום	יְרִים	יְרֻום	<i>He is exalted to show mercy to you</i>
Isa 30:19	תְּבִכָּה	תְּבֻכוּ	תְּבִכָּה	<i>You will weep no more...</i>
Isa 30:25	תְּאַמְּנָנוּ	תִּיאָמְנוּ	תִּיאָמְנוּ	When you turn to the right...
Isa 30:25	יְבָלִי	יְוָבֵלִי	יְבָלִי	Watercourses
Isa 30:29	לְכָם	לְכָמָה	לְכָם	You will have a song in the night...
Isa 30:29	הַתְּקִדְשָׁה חָג	הַתְּקִדְשׁוּ חָג	הַתְּקִדְשָׁה חָג	As when a feast is sanctified...
Isa 30:31	יְבָה	יְאָבוֹ	יְבָה	he strikes
Isa 30:32	מְוִסְדָּה	מוֹסְדָּו	מְוִסְדָּה	his appointed staff
Isa 30:33	תְּפִתְחָה	תְּפִתְחָה	תְּפִתְחָה	his tophet
Isa 30:33	הָוָא	הִיה	הָוָא	Indeed it [the tophet] is prepared for the king...

	נִיא			
Isa 30:33	הוֹכֵן	יוכן הכהני	הוֹכֵן	It was prepared
Isa 30:33	הָעַמְקִים	והעמיקי	הָעַמְקִים	Made wide

III. Commentary

vs 1

The MT has נָעַם whereas the 1QIsa^a uses נְאוּם. In regards to the different spelling, Kutscher states that the word was obviously pronounced *num* and not *naum*, “and hence it was immaterial whether the **ו** was written before or after the root נ...”¹

The MT uses מִנֵּי whereas the 1QIsa^a uses מִמְנֵי. Kutscher states that in Aramaic always means whereas in BH מִן may also mean – usually in poetical texts. In our case, מִמְנֵי and מִנֵּי mean the same.

vs 4

The MT has פִּיהִין whereas the 1QIsa^a has בִּיהִה. בִּיהִה is the antecedent of שָׂרֵי thus it would seem that 1QIsa^a takes שָׂרֵי as singular: ‘his prince’. The LXX does not have the possessive but rather the stative: “For there are princes in Hanes, evil messengers.” (Isa 30:4 LXE). The confusion surrounding this verse may be due to uncertainty as to whether the princes and messengers belong to Hezekiah or to Pharaoh. We default to the MT reading of the text as there is no compelling reason to read it according to the DSS or the LXX.

vs 5

The MT *qere* has הַבִּישׁ (to put to shame) whereas the *ketiv* is הַבָּאֵישׁ (to make odious). Kutscher states that בָּאֵשׁ is sometimes confused with בֹּוּשׁ which in Aramaic means ‘bad’.² This may explain why 1QIsa^a amends the text כָּלָה בָּאֵשׁ which Beuken suggests should be translated as ‘destroyed in fire’.³ This confusion is also reflected in the LXX. It is preferable to go with the *qere* reading הַבִּישׁ. The infinitive construct form of the word also appears in vs. 3 where it states that the protection of Pharaoh will be לְבַשְׁתָּ (for shame). This interpretation is supported by Ibn Ezra who likewise notes that that the aleph is superfluous”⁴

¹ Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa[Superscript a])*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah (Leiden: Brill, 1974). 56

² Ibid. 222

³ Wim Beuken, *Isaiah*, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven: Peeters, 2000). 135

⁴ Ibn Ezra translates it “everyone blamed” speaking of those that went down to Egypt.

vs 6

1QIsa^a has בָּאָרֶץ צְרָה וְצִיה וְצֹוקָה צִיה is not in the MT or the LXX.

1QIsa^a has מַחְנֵם וְאֵין מִים in place of מַחְנֵם in the MT. The MT is difficult to read here as it is not clear what the antecedent for מַחְנֵם is. Wildberger takes מַחְנֵם to be a participle form of נַחַם (growling). In this case מַחְנֵם is parallel to מַעֲפָתָן מַעֲפָתָן so that the growling of lions is compared to the flying of serpents.⁵ Beuken argues that the parallelism does not work well, and that in any case, מַחְנֵם should be in the plural if it refers to both לְבִיא וְלִשְׁאָלָן. He therefore suggests that מַחְנֵם refers to the land of distress in which is found lions and lionesses.⁶ The MT is certainly the more difficult reading, but there is no clear proof that the text is corrupted. 1QIsa^a seems to have made an emendation here to smooth the reading.

1QIsa^a has אָשָׁו instead of the אָשָׁוֹן of the MTT. The antecedent for אָשָׁו may be the messengers and princes mentioned in vs. 3. It is not clear why 1QIsa^a should make it singular. Kutscher mentions this but does not have a solution.⁷

vs 7

The MTT has לְזֹאת whereas 1QIsa^a has לְזֹאתה. It is not clear why the feminine singular demonstrative pronoun is used in both cases. Ibn Ezra suggests that it be translated “to this” – ie. to Jerusalem.

More significantly, the MT has רְהַב הֵם שְׁבַת whereas 1QIsa^a has שְׁבַת רְהַב. Many modern commentaries take רְהַב to be a mythical creature that represents chaos and שְׁבַת as its opposite meaning “to cease, or be still.”⁸ It is possible to translate MT without emendation : “Rahav are they, sitting” or “Are they Rahab? Sitting still!”⁹ Another possibility is to amend the text to get רְהַב הַמְשֻׁבֶת which gives many options for the translator: ie. “Rahav,

⁵ Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3 vols., vol. 3, Continental Commentaries (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991). in loc.

⁶ Beuken, *Isaiah*. 135

⁷ Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa[Superscript a])*. 403

⁸ Beuken, *Isaiah*. 134

⁹ John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 1-39*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986).

the one who sits". Irwin takes מִתְּנַשֵּׁה as 'roar' thereby translating the phrase as: "the roaring of Rahab is still".¹⁰ Ibn Ezra takes שָׁבֶת to be the infinitive construct of יִשְׁבֶּה meaning to sit, and מִתְּנַשֵּׁה as a pronominal suffix of רָהָב. In this case רָהָב means 'strength' and the phrase may be translated: "their strength is to sit still".¹¹ The phrase must then refer to those who stayed in Jerusalem as opposed to those who went down to Egypt to get help or to the Egyptians. The DSS also makes מִתְּנַשֵּׁה a pronominal suffix of רָהָב. Pronominal suffixes are not usually attached to proper names which makes it unlikely that the scribe of 1QIsa^a understood רָהָב to be a proper name for a monster that personified chaos.

In our opinion, the MT is the better text in this instance. The juxtaposition of שָׁבֶת alongside רָהָב suggests that there is an intentional play on words. The root שָׁבַת offers a better contrast than רָהָב to יִשְׁבֶּה – a name that appears elsewhere as a symbol of chaos. The MT seems to preserve more archaic language, it is the more difficult reading, and therefore should be preferred over 1QIsa^a.

The MT has אֲוֹתָם whereas 1QIsa^a has אֲוֹתָם. The difference seems to be between inscribing something in a tablet 'in their presence' vs. inscribing 'them' in a tablet. The use of תְּנַשֵּׁה with the meaning of 'before' is rare, but not unknown. (cf. Gen 20:16b, Mi 6:1; see also BDB תְּנַשֵּׁה || 950 1.c) It is puzzling that כְּתֻבָה is used with לְיִחְיָה and סִפְרָה with תְּקַהָה. One would have expected it to be the other way around.

vs 9

The MT has the infinitive construct עֲמֹדֵשׁ whereas the DSS adds the prepositional prefix to form עַשְׂמוֹעַ. The MT is the more difficult reading and is therefore preferred.

vs 10

The reconstruction of 4QIsa^c has תְ[ו]מַחְתָּלוֹת; the MT has מַחְתָּלוֹת; and 1QIsa^a has מַתְּלֹות. If the root is הַתְּלִל as suggested by HALOT then the MT preserves the better reading.

¹⁰ Beuken, *Isaiah*. 134

¹¹ Abraham ben Meir Ibn Ezra and M. Friedländer, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, 4 vols. (London, : Pub. by N. Trübner, 1873). 139

vs 11

The MT, 4QIsa^c and 1QIsa^b has סָרוּ whereas 1QIsa^a has the hiphil (?). The majority reading סָרוּ is preferred.

vs 12

The MT, 4QIsa^c, and 1QIsa^b have the niphal participle, masc., sing. form of the root נִלְזֹ – לִזְ – meaning “intrigue” whereas 1QIsa^a has וַתְעַלֹּז meaning “and you will exult” (HALOT 7036). Wildberger suggests that the 1QIsa^a scribe did not understand the rare word נִלְזֹ whose meaning remains ambiguous. Wildberger states, “It probably means roughly “something perverted, intrigue.”¹²

vs 14

The MTT has the qal, 3rd, masc., sing form יְחַמֵּל whereas 1QIsa^a has the qal, 3rd, masc. plural form יְחַמְּלוּ. 1QIsa^a has וְלֹחַסּוּ spelled with a ס instead of a ש. מגבָא is spelled מגבָא. Wildberger thinks that these are no more than instances of sloppy copying of the text.¹³

vs 15

1QIsa^a has בְשׁוֹבֶה instead of שׁוֹבֶה. The root seems to be שׁוֹב. Wildberger notes that constructions such as שִׁיבָה are common in Rabbinic Hebrew. Many have looked for an etymology of that parallels בְשׁוֹבֶה. For example Ibn Ezra translates בְשׁוֹבֶה as “in rest” with the meaning, “You will find salvation at home, and you need not go down to Egypt.”¹⁴ Wildberger, on the other hand, notes that the traditional meaning of שׁוֹב, meaning ‘return’, was in the prophet Isaiah’s lexicon and should be accepted in this instance.¹⁵

vs 17

1QIsa^a lacks the definite article ה before הר – הר (– רַאֲשֵׁה הָר) vs. רַאֲשֵׁה הָר. This is probably a copying error.

vs 18

לְחַנְנָכֶם of the MT and לְחוֹגְכֶם of 1QIsa^a suggests the use of different roots: חַזֵן (meaning?) vs. חַנֵן? לְחַנְנָכֶם in the MT is the infinitive construct of חַנֵן meaning “to show favor”.

¹² Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3. 149

¹³ Ibid. 149

¹⁴ Ibn Ezra and Friedländer, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. 141

¹⁵ Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3.

1QIsa^a has יְרִים instead of יְרִים. The ' and the ı are easily confused. In this case, the MT has the better reading.

vs 19

MT has the qal, yiktol, 2nd person, masc., sing verb תִּבְפֹּה preceded with the infinitive absolute בָּכָה. 1QIsa^a has the plural form תִּבְפֹּה instead of - a logical emendation. Wildberger notes that, “this manuscript frequently employs the plural verb when used with a collective noun.”¹⁶

vs 20

MT has יַבְנֵף singular which does not agree with the plural subject מִזְרִיךְ. This suggests that מִזְרִיךְ should be repointed to make it singular. 1QIsa^a has the plural form indicating that it understood מִזְרִיךְ to be plural. The MT is the favored reading on the basis of lexio defficilior.

vs 21

Wildberger suggests that תִּאֲמִינֵנוּ in the MT should be repointed to conform with תִּאֲמִינֶנוּ of 1QIsa^a. Ibn Ezra likewise notes that the נ is frequently substituted for the י.¹⁷

vs 23

וְהִיא of the MT and 1QIsa^b is the more difficult reading and should therefore be favored instead of יְהִיא of 1QIsa^a. In instances where the first bicolon stands in casus pendens relationship to what follows, it is common to find a י.¹⁸

כָּר נְרַחַב in the MT functions as a ‘verbal accusative’.¹⁹ כָּר נְרַחַב in 1QIsa^a is a scribal error as נְרַחַב ‘stormy’ doesn’t make sense. Ibn Ezra suggested the text should be amended to כָּר which means ‘broad plain’.²⁰ However, כָּר is found elsewhere with the meaning of ‘meadow’.

¹⁶ Ibid. 167

¹⁷ Ibn Ezra and Friedländer, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. 142

¹⁸ Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3. 168

¹⁹ Ibid. 168

²⁰ Ibn Ezra and Friedländer, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. 142

vs 25

1QIsa^a has מים יובלִי whereas the MT and 1QIsa^b has מים יובלִי. Notscher took in 1QIsa^a as a qal plural construct participle (carriers of). Wildberger disagrees, noting that there is no instance of the use of the qal with the root יבל.²¹ The context suggests that ‘streams of water’ is the better reading.

vs 28

1QIsa^a has לנפה whereas the MT has the noun לנפה. The loss of the ה in Q^a also occurs in the MT. It seems to be case of the hiphil prefix merging with the preposition נ.²²

vs 29

התקדשׁ in 1QIsa^a – “they sanctified the festival,” whereas the MT has the construct חגָג.²³

vs 31

1QIsa^a smooth’s the reading by adding a 3rd, masc. sing. pronomial suffix. The MT lacks the direct object. Alternatively, it may be possible to read the ה in יבַה of the MT as a 3rd, masc. sing. pronomial suffix. (see Wildberger – below vs. 32)

vs 32

1QIsa^a has מוסדו whereas the MT has מושךְה. The ה suffix in this instance should be read as a masculine pronominal suffix in line with 1QIsa^a. Likewise, the ktuv reading בָה that follows נלֵחֶם in the MT.²⁴ The MT preserves a more archaic form and is therefore the preferred reading.

vs 33

1QIsa^a has תפתח whereas the MT has תפתחת. The inclusion of the ה is not expected as the word is spelled חפתח elsewhere. Wildberger lists several suggestions that have been put forward to explain the ה: Gesenius suggests it was a paragogic ה; Ges-Buhl suspects that the ה is an interrogatory particle, to be taken with the following word. Wildberger argues that

²¹ Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3. in. loc.

²² Ibid. 186

²³ Ibn Ezra and Rashi, Targum Jonathan: “This rejoicing will come to you on the eve of Passover.” Ibn Ezra and Friedländer, *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. Note on pg. 144

²⁴ Wildberger, *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*, 3.

this is still another example of a variant third masculine singular suffix.²⁵ (see vs. 32 above) As noted above, this latter explanation also makes sense of the ה in מושָׁךְה. It also agrees with the ktuv reading of the MT אָנָה that follows.

²⁵ Ibid. in. loc.

IV. Bibliography

- Beuken, Wim. *Isaiah*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir, and M. Friedländer. *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*. 4 vols London,: Pub. by N. Trübner, 1873.
- Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQ Isa[Superscript a])*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Oswalt, John. *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 1-39*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah : A Continental Commentary*. Continental Commentaries. 3 vols. Vol. 3, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.